

#### IV. Remarks.

The Examiner entered the following rejections.

1. Claim 13, 16 and 18 as understood, are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Adachi et al. (5,289,813).

As to amended claim 13, and in reply to the Response to Arguments, Applicant respectfully asserts that the reference does not fully disclose the claimed invention as amended.

Respectfully, in the Response to Arguments the Examiner misidentifies flyweight 8 with pulley 9. In fact, Adachi does not transmit torque through flyweight 8 and there is no damper between the one-way clutch 40 and pulley 9. Hence the inferred combination is not present as argued by the Examiner, namely, "an accessory pulley 8 is connected to the clutch via the damper".

Hence, the following limitation is not taught by the reference, namely, "at least one accessory rotatably connected to the clutch unit and to the one-way clutch through the damper such that the accessory is driven by the clutch unit".

As noted above the torque flow (rotation) through the harmonic balancer does not include the damper (7). However, the limitation states the accessory is rotatably connected to the one-way clutch through the damper. No such connected is taught by the reference since the damper only connects between the clutch and the damper weight (8), which does not transmit rotation to the accessory. Instead rotation is transmitted to the accessory through pulley 9, which does not include the damper.

In the absence of teaching directed to rotation transmitted through the damper, Adachi fails to anticipate claim 13. Applicant requests the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 16 and 18 are dependent from claim 13.

2. Claims 14, 15 and 17, as understood, are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adachi et al. in view of WO (97/31198).

Claims 14, 15 and 17 are dependent from claim 13.

3. Claims 9, 11-12, as understood, are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over McRae (2,911,961) in view of WO (97/31198).

As to amended claim 9, the Examiner observes that McRae does not teach the inertial member and the damping member. WO (97/31198) is cited for the proposition of providing these components. However, the WO reference does not satisfy the following limitation, namely,

"a one-way clutch comprising a damper, the one-way clutch directly mounted to the rotating shaft"

As noted in the paper filed September 24, 2009, referring to Figure 1, hub (5) is keyed (2) to shaft (1). Polymer (7) is disposed between balancer flange (6) and balancer flyweight (8), please see page 5, lines 12-25 of the WO publication. These features (5, 6, 7, 8) together comprise a harmonic balancer.

One-way clutch (40) operationally isolates pulley (9) from shaft (1), see WO page 7, lines 4-17. However, torque flows from flange (6) to clutch (40) and then to pulley (9), bypassing polymer (7) and balancer (8). Polymer (7) and balancer (8) are not relevant to the operation of the pulley and one-way clutch since torque does not flow through these components, i.e., (7) and (8), see Figure 1. Polymer (7) and balancer (8), versus pulley (9) are mechanically separate.

On the other hand, as to amended claim 9, the instant invention as claimed comprises the damper (68) disposed between the pulley (66) and the one-way clutch (42). See application Fig. 3, page 5, lines 14-25. In the claimed arrangement the accessory is drivingly connected through the one-way clutch (42), damper (68) and pulley (66). In this way, positioning damper (68) between the one-way clutch (42) and the pulley (66) in the torque flow allows for a "soft-landing" for the one-way clutch during torque reversals which enhances life expectancy of the one-way clutch.

Hence, the following limitation is not taught by the reference, namely, "at least one accessory rotatably connected to the clutch unit and to the one-way clutch through the damper such that the accessory is driven by the clutch unit".

As noted above the torque flow (rotation) through the Adachi harmonic balancer does not include the damper (7). However, the claim limitation states the accessory is rotatably connected to the one-way clutch through the damper. No such connection is taught by Adachi since the damper only connects the clutch (40) and the damper weight (8), and as such does not transmit rotation through damper (7) from the clutch to an accessory.

There is no incentive to combine these references since the noted limitation is not taught as claimed.

Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 9.

4. Claim 10, as understood, is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over McRae in view of WO (97/31198) as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of JP (59-47528).

Claim 10 depends from claim 9.

V. Fees.

Any fees payable for this response and RCE may be deducted from deposit account 070475 in the name of the Gates Corporation.

Thank you for your attention to this case.

Sincerely,



Jeffrey Thurnau  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 42,183  
303-744-4743

Date: APR 21, 2010